

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA
SOUTHWEST DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) CASE 1:10-cr-00041-0001

)

U.S.

) NOTICE OF Void order

) Dated 09-02-2010

MICHAEL H REED @TM)

GREGORY ALLEN DAVIS @TM)

)

)

September 3, 2010

Comes now, by "special appearance" (emphasis added, Black's Law
8th edition) Boakonannaishkawaandlen: Michael-Howard:-
Reed-original-heris-by-blood-for-the-Great-Turtle-Island,
Non-corporat/citizenship/trustee/corporation/entity/agent/
indian/BIA/DIA/Beneficiary-for-the-United-States-of-
America-Inc.; in peace, in honor, supper protest for dishonor,
sends greetings and salutations to you and each of you that
this presents; with cooperation and to clear any defects
along the way: without waiver for original venue, jurisdiction,
for esens, heris by blood for the LittleShell, for the Great-
Turtle-Island: stats as fallowes;

1. Given Thomas J. Wright et al last response (Government's response to Defendant's motion for defect in instituting the prosecution and response to motion to suppress, 8/30/2010). "I URGE" The Government to question Thomas J. Wright et al ability to represent The Government due to his apparent inability to read, or otherwise comprehend "LEGAL LANGUAGE", Based on Black's Law 8th Ed, understand or recognize a well recognized dictionary of law terminology direct Quoting of U.S.C. along with case-referencing, as well as "Basic English" language; and
2. I further question Mr Thomas J. Wrights et al ability to effectively and properly represent The Governments of The United States by this apparent Ignorance, or possible wanton ignoring of judicial procedure (aka due process) by referencing docket document number 45 (filed 8/2/10) the question comes about in further "Review" of the docket for this case, no where on the docket is it shown that Thomas J. Wright et al initiated the Court's authoring of document 45, This shows, if not proves Thomas J Wright et al ignorance of judicial procedure/law/statutes/-due process and therefore inept ability to

Effectively and more importantly properly represent the Government because document 45 is indirect violation of "DUE PROCESS" because document 45 is written proof of the court (CHARLES B. KORNMAN) coming in as a 3RD party intervener, see Sixteenth Jurisprudence Second Edition, Section 177; and therefore when citing of document 45 peripatate CHARLES B. KORNMAN "Purverstick Statements" and Without Jurisdiction is engaged in a act of TREASON; U.S. v. will 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101, S. CT. 471, 66 L. ED 2d 392, 406 (1980); Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 246, 404, 5 L. ED 257 (1821); and Valleu v. Northern Fire and Marine Ins. Co, 254 U.S. 348, 41 S. Ct. 116 (1920) See also Old Wane Mut. I, Assoc. v. McDonough, 204 U.S. 8, 278. Ct. 236 (1907) Williamson v. Berry, 8 How. 495, 540, 12 L. Ed. 1170, 1189, (1850); Rose v. Himely, 4 Cranch 241, 269, 2 L. Ed. 608, 617 (1808); and United States of America is bound by a Constitution made lawful by this Charter, By TREATY OF 1866. 14 STATS 769a United States Government of Indian tribes was signed and was signed and made lawful; IT begs to question wheather CHARLES B. KORNMAN et/al and Thomas J. Wright et/al are simpley inept or are Dolt's; and

3. IT appears Mr Wright, and the court has chosen, yet again, to simply and erroneously, deny the defendant's motions, on the whole, upon "questionable reasons" rather than actually qualifying, line-by-line, the reasons for denial, being that the burden of proof lies on those "claiming" Jurisdiction to do so, the burden is thrust upon Mr. Thomas J. Wright et al to prove all invalid and/or Erroronious parts of motions submitted by the defendants, for Qualifying his claim for denial; and
4. Once again CHARLES B. KORNMAN has come in as a 3rd party intervener with order dated September 2, 2010, and has violated all the laws prescribe for The United States of America, and the Constitution, and still has not proven Jurisdiction over a sovereign nation, Sovereign people of the esens-people-of-the-Grate-turtle-island; and
5. This court is bound by the Constitution made lawful by this charter, by 1866. 14 STAT 769 a United States Government of Indian Tribes was signed and made lawful; and

- 6 The force and effect of treaties under this provision, any treaty when made becomes in effect, a statute enacted by the Federal Government which is controlling on the courts in re Ramberg's Estate 1940, 20 N.Y.S.2d 619, 174, Misc, 306; and
- 7 When a treaty has been made by the proper Federal authority and ratified it becomes the law of the land, and the courts have no power to question, or rights of the nation or tribe with whom it is made; the action of the treaty making power is conclusive, upon such inquiry, Maiden v. Ingersoll, 1859, 6 Mich, 376; and

Therefore this court is void ab initio, and does not have jurisdiction; and CHARLES B. KORNMAN MUST RECUSE HIMSELF FROM THIS CASE AND THE BENCH; AND MUST DISMISS THIS CASE 1:10-CR-00041-0001, MELO VS. U.S. 505 F2d, 1026.

Bax-Long-Brown-McIntosh
Bax-Long-Brown-McIntosh